



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/821,657 04/08/2004 H. Garrett Wada 100/18002 8775

21569 7590 04/10/2007  
CALIPER LIFE SCIENCES, INC.  
605 FAIRCHILD DRIVE  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94043-2234

EXAMINER
----------

SALMON, KATHERINE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS 04/10/2007 PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/821,657

Applicant(s)

WADA ET AL.

Examiner

Katherine Salmon

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29, 31-44, 51, 53 and 55-100 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5, 7, 80 and 82 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8-29, 31-44, 51, 53, 55-79, 81, 83-100 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/21/2006</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. This action is in response to the papers filed 12/21/2006. Currently, Claims 1-29, 31-44, 51, 53, and 55-100 are pending. Claims 30, 45-50, 52, and 54 have been canceled. Claims 5, 7, 80, 82 are withdrawn as being drawn to an nonelected invention.

2. The following rejections for Claims 1-4, 6, 8-29, 31-44, 51, 53, 55-79, 81, and 83-100 are either newly applied, as necessitated by amendment, or are reiterated.

Response to arguments follows.

3. This application contains Claims 5, 7, 80, 82 are drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 4/28/2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

4. This action is FINAL.

**Withdrawn Rejections**

5. The rejection of Claims 30-32, 39-41, 52, and 54-56 made under 35 USC 112/2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph in section 4 of the previous office action is moot in view of the cancellation of the claims.

**Rejections Necessitated by Amendment**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 37-40, and 95-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 37-38 and 95-96 are indefinite. Claims 37-38 recites the limitation "the one or more conjugates" in lines 2-3 of both claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 37-38 and 95-96 depend from Claim 10, which only describes "a conjugate". It is suggested that the claims be amended to correct antecedent basis.

Claims 39-40 and 97 recites the limitation "the labeled analogue" in lines 2-3 of claims 39-40. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is not clear if the labeled analogue is referring to the labeled analyte or to some other labeled compound.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3, 6, 9-29, 33, 35-44, 51-55, 59-65, 67, 68-78, 81, 83, 85-86, 90, and 92-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawabata et al. (EP 1376126A1 3/04/2002) as evidenced by Walston et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0055591 December 27, 2001).

CLAIM 1 is an independent Claim.

With regard to Claim 1, Kawabata et al. teaches a method of measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 1 paragraph 0008). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex (separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (p. 13 paragraph 73). Kawabata et al. teaches adding heparin (charged polymer) to the solution of nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances in the separation method (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Walston et al. defines heparin is a polysaccharide with a strong negative charge (p. 2 paragraph 0016). Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis with a channel diameter preferably 1 to 200 microns (p. 12 paragraph 58). Kawabata et

Art Unit: 1634

al. teaches using heparin to block nucleases to inhibit digestion therefore reducing the interference from Dnase and Rnase (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Kawabata et al. teaches a method for measuring (detecting) a target separated by complexing with a nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substance (abstract).

Claims 2-3, 6, 9-13, 22, 27, 35-36, 43-44 depend from Claim 1

With regard to Claims 2-3, and 6, Kawabata et al. teaches using heparin (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Walston et al. teaches heparin is a polysaccharide with a strong negative charge (p. 2 paragraph 0016).

With regard to Claims 9 and 22, Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain affinity substance is labeled with a marker (Figure 2). With regard to Claims 11, 12, and 13, Kawabata et al. teaches the binding of "protein" and "peptide chain"; "antigen" and "antibody"; "sugar chain" and "lectin"; "enzyme" and "inhibitor"; and "receptor" and "ligand" (p. 6 paragraph 20).

With regard to Claim 10, Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). Claims 16-18 defines nucleic acids as having a negative charge. Kawabata et al. teaches the addition of the charged substance improves separation ability (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

With regard to Claim 27, Kawabata et al. teaches the use of fluorescent dyes and radioactive tracers (p. 8 paragraph 26).

Art Unit: 1634

With regard to Claim 35, Kawabata et al. teaches the diameter of the capillary channel (cross sectional microscale dimension) of between 1 to 200 microns (p. 12 paragraph 58).

Claims 14-21, 23-26, 28-29, 33, 37, 38, 94-96 depend from Claim 10

With regard to Claim 14, Kawabata et al. teaches the charged carrier molecule is a nucleic acid chain (anionic) (p. 3-4 paragraph 6). With regard to Claim 15, the charged carrier molecule is a nucleic acid chain (negative charge) and the charged polymer is a heparin (negative charge).

With regard to Claims 16-17, Kawabata et al. teaches the charged carrier is a nucleic acid chain (nucleotide chain, DNA) (p. 3-4 paragraph 6).

With regard to Claims 18, Kawabata et al. teaches the charged carrier is a nucleic acid chain (nucleotide chain, DNA) (p. 3-4 paragraph 6). Kawabata et al. teaches the nucleic acid chain used may be prepared by chemical synthesis (synthetic) (p. 6 paragraph 15). With regard to Claims 19-21, Kawabata et al. teaches a method of labeling the nucleic acid with a linker, such as, Sulfo-SMPB (sulfosuccinimidyl) (succinimide group) (p. 7 paragraph 22 and p. 9 paragraph 32).

With regard to Claims 23-24, Kawabata et al teaches a nucleic acid chain attached to an affinity substance and labeled with a marker (Figure 2). The conjugate is the nucleic acid chain attached to the affinity substance. With regard to Claim 25, Kawabata et al. teaches the nucleic acid chain is labeled (Figure 2).

Claim 26 is drawn to an affinity molecule in the conjugate, which is labeled by a detectable marker. The claim is not limited to a label, which is directly connected to the

Art Unit: 1634

affinity or directly connected with a linker to an affinity. Therefore, since in the conjugate the nucleic acid is directly attached to the affinity and the nucleic acid is labeled the affinity would be labeled. Kawabata et al. teaches a method using an Alexa488-labeled anti-AFP antibody Fab' fragment (p. 24 p. 152).

With regard to Claim 28, Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis (p. 12 paragraph 58). With regard to Claim 29, Kawabata et al. teaches the separation media can be comprised of polyethylene glycol, polyacrylamide, polyethylene oxide, or polyvinylpyrrolidone (p. 12, paragraph 59).

With regard to Claim 33, Kawabata et al. teaches using heparin in a solution containing the target (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Walston et al. teaches heparin is a polysaccharide with a strong negative charge (p. 3 paragraph 5).

With regard to Claim 36, Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 2 paragraph 8). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex (separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (p. 13 paragraph 74). Kawabata et al. teaches a method of measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). With regard to Claim 94, Kawabata et al. teaches at least two affinity molecules which bind to the target (analyte) at different sites (Figure 4).

With regard to Claim 43, Kawabata et al. teaches targets comprising serum, plasma, urine, feces, and environmental samples (p. 11 paragraph 49). With regard to



Art Unit: 1634

Claim 44, Kawabata et al. teaches a target comprising AFP, FSH, TSH, LH, HIV, CA10-19, CA125, PSA, or T4 (p. 5 paragraph 56).

Claim 37 has every limitation of Claim 10, but also includes the limitation that two or more conjugates are used wherein each affinity molecule is capable of binding the analyte at a different site. Kawabata et al. teaches at least two affinity molecules (in a complex) which bind to the target (analyte) at different sites (Figure 4). With regard to Claim 95, Kawabata et al. teaches at least two affinity molecules which bind to the target (analyte) at different sites (Figure 4).

Claim 38 has every limitation of Claim 10, but also the limitation that the affinity molecule and the affinity molecule in the conjugate have a property capable of binding to the analyte at a different site on the analyte from every other affinity molecule. Kawabata et al. teaches a method in which the nucleic acid (charged carrier molecule), affinity molecules, and analytes are in a solution together (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches at least two affinity molecules (in a complex) which bind to the target (analyte) at different sites (Figure 4). With regard to Claim 96, Kawabata et al. teaches at least two affinity molecules which bind to the target (analyte) at different sites (Figure 4).

Claim 39 is an independent Claim and Claims 40-41, and 97-99 depend from Claim 39

With regard to Claims 39-41 and 97-99, Kawabata teaches a method in which an analyte, affinity, and a charge polymer form a complex which is labeled (first complex) (Figure 6). The claim does not limit how the analyte is labeled so therefore a conjugate comprising the analyte, affinity, and a labeled charged polymer would encompass the

Art Unit: 1634

claims. Kawabata et al. teaches 2 or more of these complexes can be made (Figure 6). Kawabata et al. teaches separating the sample (Figure 6). Kawabata et al. teaches 2 or more affinity molecules can be used (Figure 6). Kawabata et al. teaches measuring and determining the amount of analyte in the sample (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches at least two affinity molecules which bind to the target (analyte) at different sites (Figure 4).

Claim 42 is an independent Claim and Claims 100 depend from Claim 42

With regard to Claim 42, it is unclear in the claim which combination is actually needed in the first complex. With regard to the first complex, Kawabata et al. teaches contacting the sample with a complex of analyte, affinity, and detectable marker (figure 2). Since the analyte is labeled in this complex because of the attachment of the labeled charged molecule it is unclear what the difference it between the first and second complex. Kawabata et al, teaches 2 or more types of targets can be labeled (forming 2 or more complexes) and separated (Figure 6). Further Kawabata et al. teaches that two ore more affinity molecules may be used in the separation (Figure 6). With regard to Claim 100, Kawabata et al. teaches at least two affinity molecules which bind to the target (analyte) at different sites (Figure 4).

Claim 51 is an independent Claim.

With regard to Claim 51, Kawabata et al. teaches contacting a sample, with an affinity attached to a nucleic acid chain, which is labeled (Figure 2). Kawabata et al.

Art Unit: 1634

teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis (p. 12 paragraph 58).

Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore, the first capillary is a concentration channel. Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54). Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches the addition of the charged substance improves separation ability (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

Claims 52-55, 59-65, 67, 68-78, 81, 83, 85-86, 90, and 92 depend from Claim 51

With regard to Claim 52, the specification does not define noise constituent. Kawabata et al. teaches a separation of the conjugate from the nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substance-marker not involved in the formation of the complex. Therefore in separating the conjugate not in the complex from the complex the concentration of the noise constituent is lowered. The noise constituent is anything that is not in the complex.

With regard to Claim 53, Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54). Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir,

Art Unit: 1634

applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). Therefore the complex goes through a concentration channel (first capillary) and then to the separation capillary in a solution stopping at a reservoir between the two capillaries (microchannel fluidically).

With regard to Claim 54, it is unclear how the buffer affects the sample.

Kawabata et al. teaches buffers for use in migration including tris, phosphate, Veronal, borate, Good's, SSC, TBE and TAE (p. 12 paragraph 63).

With regard to Claim 55, Kawabata et al. teaches that retention time (electrophoretic mobility) was different between the labeled conjugate and the antibody alone (noise constituents) (p. 27 paragraph 170). Kawabata et al. teaches that separation ability is improved with the use of a charged substance (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

With regard to Claims 59-61, Kawabata et al. teaches the charged carrier is a nucleic acid chain (nucleotide chain, DNA) (p. 3-4 paragraph 6). With regard to Claim 62, Kawabata et al. teaches the nucleic acid chain used may be prepared by chemical synthesis (synthetic) (p. 6 paragraph 15). With regard to Claims 63-65, Kawabata et al. teaches a method of labeling the nucleic acid with a linker, such as, Sulfo-SMPB (sulfosuccinimidyl) (succinimide group) (p. 7 paragraph 22 and p. 9 paragraph 32).

With regard to Claim 67, Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). With regard to Claims 68-69, Kawabata et al. teaches the binding of "protein" and "peptide chain" (protein: protein interaction); "antigen" and "antibody"; "sugar chain"

Art Unit: 1634

and "lectin"; "enzyme" and "inhibitor"; and "receptor" and "ligand" (p. 6 paragraph 20).

With regard to Claim 70, Kawabata et al. teaches the affinity molecule can be FAB,  $F(ab')_2$  (p. 6 paragraph 21).

With regard to Claim 71, Kawabata et al teaches a nucleic acid chain attached to an affinity substance and labeled with a marker (Figure 2). The conjugate is the nucleic acid chain attached to the affinity substance.

Claim 74 is drawn to an affinity molecule in the conjugate, which is labeled by a detectable marker. The claim is not limited to a label, which is directly connected to the affinity or directly connected with a linker to an affinity. Therefore, since in the conjugate the nucleic acid is directly attached to the affinity and the nucleic acid is labeled the affinity would be labeled. Kawabata et al. teaches a method using an Alexa488-labeled anti-AFP antibody Fab' fragment (p. 24 paragraph 152).

With regard to Claims 72-73, Kawabata et al. teaches an affinity attached to a nucleic acid chain, which is labeled (Figure 2). With regard to Claim 75, Kawabata et al. teaches the use of fluorescent dyes and radioactive tracers (p. 8 paragraph 26).

With regard to Claim 76, Kawabata et al. teaches adding heparin (charged polymer) to the solution of nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because

Art Unit: 1634

only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore, the first capillary is a concentration channel. Therefore Kawabata et al. teaches a solution with a charged polymer added to a concentration channel.

With regard to Claim 77-78, Kawabata et al. teaches using heparin in a solution containing the target (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Walston et al. teaches heparin is a polysaccharide with a strong negative charge (p. 3 paragraph 6).

With regard to Claim 81, Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2).

With regard to Claim 83, Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) and heparin (charged polymer) (Figure 2, p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Both the nucleic acid chain and heparin are negatively charged.

With regard to Claims 85-86, Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary is filled with a filler such as, polyethylene glycol, polyethylene oxide, polyvinylpyrrolidone, and polyacrylamide (p. 12 paragraph 59). With regard to Claim 90, Kawabata et al. teaches a nuclease inhibitor such as heparin is added to the sample solution (p. 23 paragraph

Art Unit: 1634

144-145). Walston et al. teaches heparin is a polysaccharide with a strong negative charge (p. 3 paragraph 6).

With regard to Claim 92, Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54).

Claim 93 is an independent Claim

With regard to Claim 93, Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). Kawabata et al. teaches a method of measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 2 paragraph 8). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex (separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (p. 13, paragraph 74). Kawabata et al. teaches adding heparin (charged polymer) to the solution of nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances in the separation method (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Kawabata et al. teaches adding heparin (charged polymer) to the solution of nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances in the separation method (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Walston et al. teaches heparin is a polysaccharide with a strong negative charge (p. 3 paragraph 5). Kawabata et al. teaches using heparin to block nucleases to inhibit digestion therefore reducing the interference from Dnase and Rnase (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145).

Art Unit: 1634

Kawabata et al. teaches a method for measuring (detecting) a target separated by complexing with a nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substance (abstract).

### **Response to Arguments**

The reply traverses the rejection. The reply asserts that Kawabata et al. do not teach a separation channel in a microfluidic device filled with separation media and a charged polymer (p. 23 2<sup>nd</sup> column). This argument has been thoroughly considered but has not been found persuasive. Kawabata et al. teaches adding heparin (charged polymer) to the solution of nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances in the separation method (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Kawabata et al. teaches that the liquid containing nucleic acid (and also with the inhibitor, heparin) migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample, which goes completely through the first capillary, is introduced into a capillary for separation (the capillary is the separation channel) (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). Therefore Kawabata et al. teaches a separation channel (capillary) that has a separation media and once the nucleic acid solution is added to the channel, the separation channel would be filled with heparin.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the



Art Unit: 1634

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 4, 8, 79, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata et al. (EP 1376126A1 3/04/2002) in view of Bickel et al. (Proceedings of Natl. Acad. Sci. November 1992 Vol. 89 p. 10001).

Kawabata et al. teaches all the limitations of the independent Claims of 1 and 51 as presented in the 102 rejection stated above. Kawabata et al. teaches a method of measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 2 paragraph 8). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex (separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (Column 13, paragraph 74). Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis with a channel diameter preferably 1 to 200 microns (p. 12 paragraph 58). Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches the addition of the charged substance improves separation ability (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore,

Art Unit: 1634

the first capillary is a concentration channel. Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54).

Kawabata et al. teaches adding heparin (charged polymer) to the solution of nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore, the first capillary is a concentration channel. Therefore Kawabata et al. teaches a solution with a charged polymer added to a concentration channel.

Kawabata et al., however, is silent with regard to if the heparin is heparin sulfate.

Bickel et al. teaches a method of detecting specific RNA-protein complexes on a polyacrylamide gel with inhibitors (Figure 1 paragraph p. 10002). With regard to Claims 4, 8, 79, and 84 Bickel et al. teaches using heparin sulfate as a nonspecific competitor in an SDS gel (p. 10003 1<sup>st</sup> column 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph and Figure 3).

Therefore it would be prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include heparin sulfate as a nonspecific competitor as taught by Bickel et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include heparin sulfate as a nonspecific

Art Unit: 1634

competitor as taught by Bickel et al., because Bickel et al. teaches the addition of heparin sulfate made the complex migrate more rapidly and simplified the pattern of proteins on the SDS gels (p. 1005 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph). Bickel et al. teaches heparin increases the intensity of faint bands (p. 1005 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

### **Response to Arguments**

The reply traverses the rejection. The reply asserts the art presented in the rejection do not teach a separation channel in a microfluidic device filled with separation media and a charged polymer. This argument has been thoroughly considered but has not been found persuasive. As discussed above in the rejection of Kawabata et al. the arguments and amendments have not overcome the art of record.

2. Claims 30-32 and 87-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata et al. (EP 1376126A1 3/04/2002) in view of Stathakis et al. (Journal of Chromatography A 1998 Vol. 817 p. 227).

Kawabata et al. teaches all the limitations of the independent Claims of 1 and 51 as presented in the 102 rejection stated above. Kawabata et al. teaches a method of measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 2 paragraph 8). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex

Art Unit: 1634

(separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (Column 13, paragraph 74).

Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis with a channel diameter preferably 1 to 200 microns (p. 12 paragraph 58). Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches the addition of the charged substance improves separation ability (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore, the first capillary is a concentration channel. Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54).

Kawabata et al., however, does not teach a separation media which comprises a charged polymer.

With regard to Claims 30 and 87, Stathakis et al. teaches a coating on the capillary electrophoresis silica fused glass, which contains dextran sulfate or polyvinyl sulfonic acid (PVS) (abstract and p. 230 2<sup>nd</sup> column Section 3.3). With regard to Claims 31-32 and 88-89, Stathakis et al. teaches a method using 0.001-0.1% dextran or 0.001-1% PVS (p. 230 last paragraph).

Therefore it would be prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include charged polymers in separation media as taught by Stathakis et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include charged polymers in separation media as taught by Stathakis et al., because Stathakis et al. teaches polymers incorporated in the separation buffer can improve migration time reproducibility (p. 229 2<sup>nd</sup> column 1<sup>st</sup> sentence).

### **Response to Arguments**

The reply traverses the rejection. The reply asserts the art presented in the rejection do not teach a separation channel in a microfluidic device filled with separation media and a charged polymer. This arguments has been thoroughly considered but has not been found persuasive. As discussed above in the rejection of Kawabata et al. the arguments and amendments have not overcome the art of record.

3. Claims 34 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata et al. (EP 1376126A1 3/04/2002) in view of Stalcup et al. (Analytical Chemistry 1994 Vol. 66 p. 3054).

Kawabata et al. teaches all the limitations of the independent Claims of 1 and 51 as presented in the 102 rejection stated above. Kawabata et al. teaches a method of

Art Unit: 1634

measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 2 paragraph 8). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex (separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (p. 13, paragraph 74).

Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis with a channel diameter preferably 1 to 200 microns (p. 12 paragraph 58). Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches the addition of the charged substance improves separation ability (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore, the first capillary is a concentration channel. Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54).

Kawabata et al. teaches adding heparin (charged polymer) to the solution of nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances in the separation method (p. 23 paragraphs 144-145). Kawabata et al. teaches using heparin to block nucleases to inhibit digestion therefore reducing the interference from Dnase and Rnase (p. 23

Art Unit: 1634

paragraphs 144-145). Kawabata et al. teaches a method for measuring (detecting) a target separated by complexing with a nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substance (abstract).

Kawabata et al., however, is silent with regard to the concentration to heparin in the buffer.

With regard to Claim 34 and 91, Stalcup et al. teaches using 2% heparin in the phosphate buffer in capillary zone electrophoresis (abstract).

Therefore it would be prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include 2% concentration or charged polymers in a buffer as taught by Stalcup et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include 2% concentration or charged polymers in a buffer as taught by Stalcup et al., because Stalcup et al. teaches the highly anionic character of heparin enhances its aqueous solubility while offering the potential for considerable electrophoretic mobility and therefore has utility as a chiral mobile phase additive in capillary zone electrophoresis (p. 3054 1<sup>st</sup> column 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

### **Response to Arguments**

The reply traverses the rejection. The reply asserts the art presented in the rejection do not teach a separation channel in a microfluidic device filled with separation media and a charged polymer. This arguments has been thoroughly considered but

Art Unit: 1634

has not been found persuasive. As discussed above in the rejection of Kawabata et al. the arguments and amendments have not overcome the art of record.

4. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata et al. (EP 1376126A1 3/04/2002) in view of Fukui et al. (Nucleic acid Research, 1996 Vol. 24 p. 3962).

Kawabata et al. teaches all the limitations of the independent Claim 51 as presented in the 102 rejection stated above. Kawabata et al. teaches a method of measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 2 paragraph 8). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex (separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (p. 13, paragraph 74). Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis with a channel diameter preferably 1 to 200 microns (p. 12 paragraph 58). Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches the addition of the charged substance improves separation ability (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first



Art Unit: 1634

capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore, the first capillary is a concentration channel. Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54).

Kawabata et al. teaches the charged carrier is a nucleic acid chain (nucleotide chain, DNA) (p. 3-4 paragraph 6). Kawabata et al. teaches the nucleic acid chain used may be prepared by chemical synthesis (synthetic) (p. 6 paragraph 15). Kawabata et al. teaches the use of ACMA as a marker (p. 8 paragraph 27).

Kawabata et al., however, does not teach a synthetic sequence consisting of a nucleotide that contains a methylene group in the place of the oxygen in the ribose ring.

Fukui et al. teaches linking ACMA to DNA (abstract). With regard to Claim 66, Fukui et al. teaches the ACMA is connector through a tri-pentamethylene linker (Abstract). Therefore, Fukui et al. teaches a synthetic sequence consisting of a linker, which has a methylene group.

Therefore it would be prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include methylene linker as taught by Fukui et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include methylene linker as taught by Fukui et al., because Fukui et al. teaches a pentamethylene linker which stabilizes the connection between ACMA and the DNA (Abstract).

## **Response to Arguments**

The reply traverses the rejection. The reply asserts the art presented in the rejection do not teach a separation channel in a microfluidic device filled with separation media and a charged polymer. This arguments has been thoroughly considered but has not been found persuasive. As discussed above in the rejection of Kawabata et al. the arguments and amendments have not overcome the art of record.

5. Claims 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata et al. (EP 1376126A1 3/04/2002) in view of Kaniansky et al. (Analytical chemistry 2000 Vol. 72 p. 3596).

Kawabata et al. teaches all the limitations of the independent Claim 51 as presented in the 102 rejection stated above. Kawabata et al. teaches a method of measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 2 paragraph 8). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex (separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (Column 13, paragraph 74). Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis with a channel diameter preferably 1 to 200 microns (p. 12 paragraph 58).

Kawabata et al. teaches contacting a sample, with an affinity attached to a nucleic acid chain, which is labeled (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches separating the

Art Unit: 1634

complex using capillary electrophoresis (p. 12 paragraph 58). Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore, the first capillary is a concentration channel. Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54). Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches the addition of the charged substance improves separation ability (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7).

Kawabata et al., however, does not teach the concentration using isotachopheresis (ITP).

With regard to Claims 57-58, Kaniansky et al. teaches a method of using a capillary electrophoresis chip with a two separation channel coupling (Abstract). Kaniansky et al. teaches using ITP as a concentration pretreatment of the analyte (Abstract).

Therefore it would be prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include the ITP concentration method as taught by Kaniansky et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include the ITP concentration method as taught by Kaniansky et al. because Kaniansky et al. teaches using an ITP concentration pretreatment quantified test analytes by 1-2% RSD (Abstract). Kaniansky et al. teaches a well-defined ITP concentration of the analyte can be integrated into the separation method of a capillary channel chip (Abstract).

### **Response to Arguments**

The reply traverses the rejection. The reply asserts the art presented in the rejection do not teach a separation channel in a microfluidic device filled with separation media and a charged polymer. This arguments has been thoroughly considered but has not been found persuasive. As discussed above in the rejection of Kawabata et al. the arguments and amendments have not overcome the art of record.

6. Claims 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata et al. (EP 1376126A1 3/04/2002) in view of Wolfe et al. (Electrophoresis March 23, 2002 Vol. 23 p. 727).

Kawabata et al. teaches all the limitations of the independent Claim 51 as presented in the 102 rejection stated above. Kawabata et al. teaches a method of

Art Unit: 1634

measuring a target (detecting an analyte) (Abstract). Kawabata et al. teaches a target substance (analyte) is reacted with an affinity molecule forming a complex (p. 2 paragraph 8). Kawabata et al. teaches the separation of the complex from nucleic acid chain-binding affinity substances not involved in the formation of the complex (separation of the complex and unbound affinity molecule) (Column 13, paragraph 74). Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis with a channel diameter preferably 1 to 200 microns (p. 12 paragraph 58).

Kawabata et al. teaches contacting a sample, with an affinity attached to a nucleic acid chain, which is labeled (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches separating the complex using capillary electrophoresis (p. 12 paragraph 58). Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7). For the first capillary, the sample is concentrated because only the sample that goes through the entire first capillary is introduced into the capillary for separation, therefore, the first capillary is a concentration channel. Kawabata et al. teaches the capillary used is 100 micron or less (p. 11-12 paragraph 54). Kawabata et al. teaches a nucleic acid chain (charge carrier molecule) attached to an affinity substance attached to a target (analyte) (Figure 2). Kawabata et al. teaches the addition of the charged substance improves separation ability (p. 2-3 paragraph 9).

Kawabata et al. teaches a method of capillary chip electrophoresis comprising adding a buffer and sample to a sample reservoir, applying voltage and migrating the sample through a capillary wherein the sample which goes completely through the first capillary is introduced into a capillary for separation (p. 12 paragraph 56 and Figure 7).

Kawabata et al., however, does not teach the concentration based on adsorption of the charged carrier.

With regard to Claims 56-57, Wolfe et al. teaches the incorporation of a silica-based solid phase extraction (SPE) system into a microchip platform (the same platform described by Kawabata et al) (Abstract). Wolfe et al. teaches the extraction procedure utilizes the adsorption of DNA onto bare silica (abstract). Wolfe et al. teaches that DNA is removed from the sample load solution and is retained in the washing step (p. 732 1<sup>st</sup> column last paragraph). Therefore DNA is adsorbed while "noise constituents" are washed away.

Therefore it would be prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include the SPE concentration method as taught by Wolfe et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the capillary electrophoresis method of Kawabata et al. to include the SPE concentration method as taught by Wolfe et al. because Wolfe et al. teaches a method of concentrating DNA (so therefore the charged carrier attached to the affinity molecule and the analyte) from noise constituents in the sample by adhering the DNA onto a silica wall (Abstract). The ordinary artisan would be motivated to use the SPE concentration method because

Art Unit: 1634

Wolfe et al. teaches the extraction of nanogram quantities of DNA in less than 25 minutes (abstract). The ordinary artisan would be motivated to concentrate the charge carrier, affinity, and analyte from noise constituents in a fast and efficient manner.

### **Response to Arguments**

The reply traverses the rejection. The reply asserts the art presented in the rejection do not teach a separation channel in a microfluidic device filled with separation media and a charged polymer. This arguments has been thoroughly considered but has not been found persuasive. As discussed above in the rejection of Kawabata et al. the arguments and amendments have not overcome the art of record.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1634

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katherine Salmon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8AM-430PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Katherine Salmon  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1634

  
CARLA J. MYERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER